

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	D. F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/617,477	10/617,477 07/11/2003		Steven Roy Lipscomb	320400-00004	3454
52396	7590	06/30/2006		EXAMINER	
		IORISHITA	COLLINS, DOLORES R		
MORISHITA LAW FIRM, LLC 3800 HOWARD HUGHES PKWY,				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 850				3711	
LAS VEGAS, NV 89169				DATE MAILED: 06/30/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		•	SP				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
,	10/617,477	LIPSCOMB ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Dolores R. Collins	3711					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailinearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from (6), cause the application to become ABANDONE	<ul> <li>I. nely filed</li> <li>the mailing date of this communication</li> <li>O (35 U.S.C. § 133).</li> </ul>					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 J	une 2006.						
_	s action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i>	•		is				
Disposition of Claims							
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3,5,7,9-13,22-26 and 28-40</u> is/are page 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>7,9-13 and 31-40</u> is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3,5,22-26, 28-29</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)	_						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	nte					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)					

Application/Control Number: 10/617,477

Art Unit: 3711

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Amendment

Examiner acknowledges response by applicant's representative received 6/8/06. Examiner further acknowledges the addition claim 40.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
  - 1. Claims 1, 26 & 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Flannery (393).

Flannery discloses a Casino Game.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
  - 2. Claims 1, 3, 5, 11-13, 24-26 & 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flannery in view of Shaw (122).

#### Regarding claims 1, 11-13, 26 & 30

Flannery teaches a table, an opaque tabletop, a dealer, a plurality of player positions, a translucent planar window with a light source (see figure 1 and [0023]. Flannery, fails to teach that his light window extends around the game table. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the light source anywhere desired or expedient on the table. Such would be considered a design issue and would present little or no difficulty to one of ordinary skill.

#### Regarding claims 3, 5, 26, 28 & 29

Flannery fails to explicitly teach a trough. Shaw discloses a Compact LCD Luminaire. Shaw teaches a trough for accommodating his light source that is

Application/Control Number: 10/617,477 Page 4

Art Unit: 3711

beneath the surface on the outer edge. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Flannery to

include a trough to provide uniform lighting.

Shaw fails to teach that his mesa is oval shaped. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the table whatever shape desired or expedient. Such would be a design issue. Mere change in shape

would present little or no difficulty to one skilled in the art.

Regarding claim 25

Examiner takes official notice that game tables are known to have rigid plates

extending around them with pads covered by various choices of desired materials.

Regarding claim 24

Examiner takes official notice that windows made of glass; Plexiglas and various

types of reflective material(s) are known in the art. The use of a milk-colored Plexiglas

would be a matter of design choice and would present little or no difficulty to one of

ordinary skill in the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7, 9-10 & 31-40 are allowed.

#### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered.

Arguments with respect to claim 1 and its dependents have not been persuasive.

Arguments with respect to claims 31-40 have been persuasive.

and are moot in view of the aforementioned rejection.

Regarding independent claim 1, applicant argues that Flannery teaches a lighting system configured to light betting spaces only and it does not extend around the table. Examiner feels that although Flannery's lighting source does not extend around his table, given that the lighting concept is taught, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to place the elements of light anywhere desired or expedient. Such would present little or no difficulty to one of ordinary skill in the art. Claim 1 remains rejected. Claims 3, 5, 11-13, 24-26 and 28-30 depend from claim 1. These claims are also rejected.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Application/Control Number: 10/617,477

Art Unit: 3711

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure and are cited to show the state of art with respect to features of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to *Dolores R. Collins* whose telephone number is *(571)* **272-4421**. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.00 A.M. - 4:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Eugene Kim* can be reached on *(571) 272-4463*. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is *571-273-8300*.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

\*\*\*6/21/06

UBERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE